

**REMARKS**

With this amendment, Applicant cancels claim 3. Claims 1 and 4-13 are all the claims pending in the application.

**1. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

**A. Claims 1 and 10-13**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 10-13 as being unpatentable over McIntyre *et al.* (US 6,149,256) [“McIntyre”] in view of Aoto *et al.* (US 6,515,761) [“Aoto”]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 has been modified to include the allowable subject matter of claim 3. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable.

Applicant submits that claims 10, 11 and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 12 recites that the printer is incorporated into the camera housing. The Examiner contends that this feature is disclosed when the cartridge 10 is inserted into slot 10b. Office Action at page 4.

McIntyre discloses a printer 13 that is incorporated into a housing that is separate from the housing of the camera 11 (Fig. 6). These housings are clearly separate as is illustrated by Kodak Digital Science, DC220 and DC260 Zoom Camera, User’s Guide. Since slot 10b is in the

housing of printer 13 and not camera 11, Applicant submits that McIntyre does not disclose or suggest this feature. Aoto does not cure this deficiency.

Although the claims should be given the broadest reasonable interpretation, the broadest reasonable interpretation must also be consistent with the interpretation that one skilled in the art would reach. MPEP at 2100-48. Here, it is clear that the components of the camera 11 are incorporated in one housing and the components of printer 13 are in a separate housing. Accordingly, McIntyre does not disclose or suggest the features in claim 12.

#### **B. Claims 4-6**

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntyre. For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

Claim 4 has been modified to depend from allowed claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 4-6 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

#### **2. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 7-9 and for indicating that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant has incorporated the allowed subject matter of claim 3 into its base claim.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Application No.: 09/598,333

Attorney Docket No. Q59726

**3. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Bhaskar Kakarla  
Registration No. 54,627

Date: December 9, 2005